

Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday November 21, 2002

Time: 9:00AM – 11:30AM

Location: Burien Public Works Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Steve Clark	City of Burien	206-248-5514
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206-439-3154
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	206-439-4741 206-973-4723 (new phone number and address)
Tom Hubbard	Port of Seattle	206-248-7135
Elizabeth Leavitt	Port of Seattle	206-433-7203 leavitt.e@portseattle.org
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle	206-988-5528 duffner.r@portseattle.org
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	206-464-1219
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park	206-248-7603 steveb@ci.normandy-park.wa.us
Curt Crawford	King County	206-296-8329
Louise Kulzer	King County	206-296-1980
Julie Cairn	King County	206-296-8032
Karen Freeman	King County – Councilmember Julia Patterson's office	(206) 296-1013 karen.freeman@metrokc.gov

Introductions and Announcements

Meeting participants introduced themselves. The meeting agenda was reviewed. There were a few new faces at the meeting – Tom Hubbard is changing jobs at the Port of Seattle and this was his last meeting. Elizabeth Leavitt and Bob Duffner, both from the Port, came to the meeting to provide transition on the project. Steve Bennett from the City of Normandy Park attended the meeting. Normandy Park is expected to re-join the project. Karen Freeman from King County Councilmember Julia Patterson's office attended the meeting as an observer.

Louise Kulzer formally announced to the PMT that she is leaving King County, and that December 5th will be her final PMT meeting. Someone from King County will attend the December 5th meeting to provide transitional project management to the project.

Action items are highlighted

Carol Hunter announced that WSDOT will be substantially reducing their financial support to the project, if not withdrawing it altogether, due to the revenue impacts of the failure of State Referendum 51 in the recent election. The PMT expressed interest in having continued involvement by WSDOT, even if they could not financially participate in the project. Carol thought this might be possible, and said she would discuss the possibility with her management.

The Agenda was modified to add the discussion of the Fact Sheet to the Public Involvement Strategy agenda item.

The PMT reviewed the Ground Rules since there were several staff transitions occurring.

Project Schedule Revisions and 2003 Schedule

Louise reported that modeling tasks for Salmon and for Miller/Walker, which are on the project's critical path, are behind schedule because of modeling staff transitions at King County and competing projects. Salmon model calibration is proceeding, but it is providing unexpected results. It is unclear whether problems with the calibration are related to complex groundwater flow patterns that the model can not accurately depict, or whether the gauging data used for the calibration is inaccurate. These calibration problems are exacerbating the schedule problems, but modeling staff resources are still the main problem. Curt Crawford and Louise Kulzer are talking to other managers at King County to address the staffing needs for the modeling tasks. There are several options being investigated. More extensive use of the modeling oversight consultant (Ralph Nelson from RW Beck) is one option, but it is not the preferred option because of the cost implications.

Once the modeling resource issue is resolved, the master schedule for the project can be updated and shared with the PMT. It is unlikely that this will happen in time for a new schedule to be presented at the December 5 meeting. In general terms, the Conditions summary work for the Salmon basin should be largely completed in 2002, however, the Miller basin Conditions summary work will be delayed into 2003.

Budget and Scoped Task Hour Updates

Julie Cairn distributed an updated Budget Report showing expended Project costs compared to the ILA estimates, and showing the cost shares per Partner. The report reflected King County payroll data through October 30, 2002.

Per King County finance staff, the bills to partners that will be generated once the ILA is signed and in hand, will cover at least through 3rd quarter, and possibly more. Depending on the billed period, the costs might be less than the handouts mentioned above reflect.

Carol Hunter believes that WSDOT will be able to pay their share of the costs incurred to date on the project (about \$5,000) even if they withdraw from the project, but she will confirm this with her management.

Louise Kulzer gave a summary of the ILA tasks and how many hours had been spent on each task compared to the estimates that were broken down in the Scope worksheet.

Action items are highlighted

A table was presented showing staff hours expended to date for each task compared to those originally estimated. The original estimate provided hours to conduct a statistically repeatable ecological survey of the streams. Based on Louise's discussions with King County ecologists, a statistical study of the streams is not feasible or appropriate for the scope of this basin planning effort. Based on this, there were about 450 staff hours that were shifted from the Ecology tasks to other tasks. In the end, there are sufficient hours that could be moved to other disciplines (Engineering, Geology, Modeling and Project Management) to cover actual or expected over-runs, without having to utilize Contingency at this time.

Even after adjusting the estimate of hours, the overall budget is tight! There have been several extra meetings that have been very useful to the project, but that weren't included in the original scope. There is a strong likelihood that the contingency will need to be drawn upon before the project is complete. King County staff will continue to provide regular updates on the status of the budget.

Normandy Park addition as a Project Partner

Steve Bennett, the Planning Manager from the City of Normandy Park, attended the meeting. He reported that the City of Normandy Park is interested in re-joining the Project as a Partner.

With WSDOT likely to drop out as a formal project partner, it was speculated that it may make sense to have Normandy Park assume the 10% cost share that was originally theirs.

The ILA has a "latecomer fee" clause. The PMT discussed this clause and its intent --to have a party joining the project "catch up" on costs that the other partners have already borne for work that benefits the latecomer. The PMT suggested that the latecomer fee in this context would probably not apply to Normandy Park if WSDOT is able to cover their share of the costs to date, and if Normandy Park is able to assume WSDOT's cost share in the future. While discussing technical work completed on the project, Louise shared comments from the King County technical staff about the lack of field survey observations in some portions of the Miller/Walker Basin due to denied requests for access. Several of the technical staff would have liked to conduct some additional field surveys in areas to which they did not have access.

The project budget does not have funds to support additional field surveys if more segments of stream could be walked, since it actually took more field time to avoid stream segments than to walk the whole thing. The addition of Normandy Park as a Project Member potentially provides access to stream segments not previously available. It was suggested that asking Normandy Park to coordinate access to these areas, and to cover the cost to augment stream surveys (if King County staff identify that this effort would add value to the project), could provide a benefit to the project in the spirit of the "latecomer fee" clause.

The Normandy Park City Council is scheduled to vote on rejoining the basin planning effort on December 10th.

Action items are highlighted

Louise Kulzer will provide the estimated costs for conducting this additional assessment work (as a "latecomer fee") to Steve Bennett on or by December 5th.

PMT members briefly discussed the process that each thought they would have to go through to amend the ILA to add Normandy Park as a partner. Most members felt that this would be primarily an administrative task that would be relatively easy to complete, especially if the cost shares to the existing partners did not change.

Curt Crawford said that the amendment of the ILA to add Normandy Park might have to go back to the King County Council for authorization, according to King County legal staff advice.

Success Criteria Summary

Louise took the items that were brainstormed at the 10/3/02 PMT meeting, and consolidated and organized them. The summary list was distributed to the PMT members, and it was briefly discussed.

The Port brought up an issue that had not been discussed previously. For portions of the basin adjacent to airport, the FAA prohibits the creation of "wildlife attraction hazards." This means that proposed solutions near the airport need to consider and address this requirement. This issue was put in the "parking lot" so that it is not forgotten. However, this consideration will affect probably "how" projects are designed more than "which" projects are designed.

PMT members were asked to provide any additional feedback on the summarized list of success criteria to Julie before the next meeting. The criteria will, among other uses, be used by the work team to focus work and to set priorities.

Salmon Basin Problems

Some additional King County technical staff observations regarding the Salmon Basin

Based on Kelly Whiting's review of the gauging data, **it appears that the Old Government Line may not have ever reached a high enough stage to overflow into Salmon Creek** (as noted above, though, there is some question about the gauging data quality). It may be useful to physically look in the bypass structure for signs of overflow, if access can be gained.

Mason Bowles took several measurements in the culvert by the sewer plant during the Salmon Basin field trip. Based on the analysis of those measurements and based on his review of other information, **the culvert by the sewer plant is a fish passage barrier for chum and coho. Also, the step down area at the mouth is a barrier to chum, which are poor swimmers.** It may or may not also be a barrier to coho, as they are better swimmers, but coho probably couldn't get past the roadway culvert anyway.

King County staff did a fish ladder design for the Sagale property about ten years ago. The project had support from Sagale, but right before construction was due to begin, Sagale backed out and denied access to the property. The details on this are somewhat

Action items are highlighted

murky. The design is probably somewhere in an archive box, but it is a warning to the group that future dealings with Sagale should be approached carefully.

Prioritization Criteria

The PMT reviewed the three Problem Prioritization Criteria that were modeled after those used in the Des Moines Creek Basin Plan. These were discussed briefly at an earlier PMT meeting. Based on King County staff's exercise in applying the criteria to the Salmon Problems, Louise proposed to modify the second criterion. As used in the Des Moines Plan, the criterion looked at whether the problem interfered with the attainment of the committee's goals. For the Salmon and Miller/Walker project, it seemed more appropriate to look at the problems in light of the success criteria rather than the goals (the "what" rather than the "how"). The second prioritization criterion was modified to be consistent with the first Success Criteria Summary, which reads:

Identify practical, cost-effective ways to improve:

- fish and other aquatic habitat
- flooding and infrastructure capacity
- water quality

Problem Categorization and Ranking

Louise also rearranged the problems into categories of problems, which made evaluation easier in some cases. This reduced the number of problems to 14. The revised problem matrix was distributed.

As a group, the PMT started ranking each of the problems by using the three criteria. Each problem and the three criteria were discussed aloud, and a consensus score ranging from 0 to 100 was assigned. In some cases, multiple scores were agreed upon, noting certain dependencies.

Five of the fourteen problems were discussed and rated by the PMT members.

After the first five problems were rated, it was pretty clear that the PMT would not get to everything on the agenda. The group decided to stop the Salmon Basin problem prioritization exercise, delaying its completion until the December 5 meeting, and to move to the Coordinated Public Involvement Strategy agenda item.

Louise has already sent the electronic problem matrix file out with the rankings the PMT completed during the meeting. PMT members were asked to spend some time before the December 5th meeting looking at the remaining 9 problems and thinking about the rankings. Louise also agreed to get work team experts to rate the problems in terms of ecological or infrastructure significance.

Action items are highlighted

Coordinated Public Involvement Strategy

The latest Fact Sheet modifications were reviewed and agreed to by the Partners. *As a clarification, the Fact Sheet is an evolving communication tool.*

Steve Clark expressed a strong interest in having a subgroup of the PMT get together to discuss the possibility of coordinating on the public involvement strategy, outside the scope of the existing project and ILA. The ILA language clearly puts the requirements for developing and implementing public involvement programs with each individual Partner agency. That being said, there may be efficiencies gained in developing coordinated messages and in having a single repository of information for the project, such as a Web site. Steve offered the possibility of Burien hosting and maintaining a project site, which could link to the partner's agencies, and which the partners could link to. The overall goal would be to develop consistent messages and to reduce redundancy of effort.

Steve Clark agreed to set up a separate meeting solely to discuss a potential coordinated public involvement strategy. Individual partners need to decide if and how they wish to participate in this subgroup.

Upcoming Meetings and Agenda Items

NEW MEETING - Coordinated Public Involvement Strategy Meeting

Steve Clark setting up (Date TBD)

December 5 PMT Meeting (9AM – 12PM) note later time. Can PMT members meet until 12:00 or even 12:30 if needed?

1. Continue Salmon Basin Problem Ranking (please spend some time on these before the meeting)
2. King County staff (tentatively Doug Chin and Mason Bowles) will present the Miller/Walker Problems to the PMT
3. Discussion of “latecomer fee” to potentially cover additional field work in the lower ~~Salmon~~ Miller and/or Walker basins.

Miller/Walker Field Trip with PMT

Louise has proposed a date of December 19th. If that date works with PMT Members and key KC staff, Doug Chin will be organizing the trip, with assistance from Julie Cairn. We will need assistance from the Port for access to Lake Reba and Laura Lake. If we do this on the 19th, we will need to reserve a longer block of time than our typical PMT meeting.

Related Attachments (double click icon to open file)

Updated PMT Roster

[112102PMTAtt01.pdf](#)

Action items are highlighted

Fact Sheet Revised based on PMT Meeting
discussion

[112102PMTAtt02.pdf](#)

Parking Lot Items

- FAA prohibits the creation of “wildlife attraction hazards.” This means that proposed solutions near the airport need to consider and address this requirement.
- Will the future conditions model run incorporate redevelopment of Park Lake Homes (Louise thought probably, but needs to be confirmed), and a potentially upsized pump station at Lake Garrett. Goldsmith & Associates is the consultant for Park Lake Homes. The Housing Authority intends to do a low impact development.

Action items are highlighted

Miller/Salmon Creek Basin Planning Effort

Contact information (updated 8/29/02)

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Steve Clark	City of Burien	206, 248-5514	stephenc@ci.burien.wa.us
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206, 439-3154	danb@ci.burien.wa.us
Don Monaghan	City of SeaTac	206, 439-4716	donald@seatac.wa.gov
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	206, 241-1996	dales@seatac.wa.gov
Curt Crawford	King County Management team	206, 296-8329	curt.crawford@metrokc.gov
Tom Hubbard	Port of Seattle	206, 248-7135	hubbard.t@portseattle.org
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle	206-988-5528	duffner.r@portseattle.org
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	206, 464-1219	hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov
Steve Bennett	Normandy Park	206, 248-7603	steveb@ci.normandy-park.wa.us
Louise Kulzer	King County, project manager	206, 296-1980	louise.kulzer@metrokc.gov
Julie Cairn	Facilitator	206, 296-8032	julie.cairn@metrokc.gov
Doug Chin	King County, project engineer	206, 296-8315	doug.chin@metrokc.gov

Burien Public Works Conference Room: 457 SW 148th St, Suite 201

Mailing addresses:

Carol Hunter
401 2nd Ave South #550
Seattle, WA 98104-2447
(206) 464-1219

Stephen Clark
Public Works Director
City of Burien
415 SW 150th
Burien WA 98166

Don Monaghan
Public Works Director
City of SeaTac
17900 International Blvd Suite 401
SeaTac 98188

Tom Hubbard
Port of Seattle
17900 International Boulevard, Suite 301
SeaTac, WA 98188-4980

Miller, Walker and Salmon Creeks Basin Plan

Questions and Answers

What is the Miller, Walker and Salmon Creek Basin Plan?

The Miller, Walker and Salmon Creek drainage basins encompass approximately 6,500 acres that was urbanized long before environmental protective standards were in place. Existing and continuing development in the area has resulted in flooding, and water quality and habitat degradation problems. The Basin Plan is intended to create a sound basis for interjurisdictional/interagency cooperation and coordination to address the surface water management problems in the basin area.

What can we gain by studying and managing our stream basins?

A scientific study will define the problems in these stream basins related to storm drainage, water quality, and aquatic habitat. Based on the study results, we can recommend solutions to protect the habitat and water quality in these streams and associated watershed areas.

We will also learn what projects will produce the best results in cost-effective ways.

Who are the partners in this effort?

The Cities of Burien and SeaTac, King County, the Port of Seattle (the Port), and the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) are parties to the current inter-local agreement.

Why work with other cities and agencies?

By cooperating, we can pool our resources and better use our taxpayers' dollars. We avoid a piecemeal approach that could duplicate tasks and leave gaps.

Under our inter-agency agreement, each Partner will contribute its fair share to a well-considered, comprehensive solution. Cooperation also helps us identify the best sites for stormwater facilities regardless of political boundaries. By earmarking these sites early, we can potentially forestall alternative uses of these properties.

What work will be done in the Miller and Salmon Creek Basin planning effort?

There are two main aspects to the basin plan:

1. To identify existing and predicted problems regarding the quantity and quality of surface water, particularly problems adversely affecting properties and aquatic resources; and
2. To cooperatively recommend cost-effective solutions to the highest priority problems of joint or common importance to ecological health and public safety.

How long will it take to complete the Miller and Salmon Creek Basin Plan effort?

The planning effort began in 2002 and will be completed by the beginning of 2005

What about Walker Creek? Is it included?

Yes, Walker Creek is the largest tributary of Miller Creek and is treated as a sub basin within the larger Miller Creek basin.

How will the Partners make decisions?

The inter-local agreement for the Miller and Salmon Creek basin plan says that all decisions will be made by consensus among the Partners.

Why is this plan being done now?

Washington State requires cities such as Burien and SeaTac to meet current standards for protecting water quality within their boundaries. The cities want to step up to this responsibility and safeguard their streams. In addition, drainage problems and the health of the Salmon and Miller stream systems have helped prompt the partners to agree on the scope, budget and decision-making process for this plan.

What is the connection between the Miller and Salmon Basin Plan and the Port's Airport expansion plan?

The Port's "Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan (CSMP)" is a stand-alone document and does not hinge on the preparation of a basin plan for the Miller Creek basin.

Will the Basin Plan facilitate the Port of Seattle's Third Runway Project?

No. It is not the intent of the Basin Plan Interlocal Agreement to contemplate, authorize, facilitate, support or oppose the Third Runway Project. The basin planning process and resulting basin plan will not be used to substitute or satisfy the Port's individual obligation to mitigate the Third Runway Project.

What if the Basin Plan identifies a regional project that would better protect streams or wetlands than the Port's CSMP? Could the Port participate in the regional project, and would it be able to change the CSMP?

Yes if there is agreement by the basin plan participants that a shared project is desirable, and the facility would meet the same performance goal stated in the CSMP, the Port could ask the Department of Ecology for a change in the CSMP to use the regional project to meet the goal. This is an important flexibility because only a limited number of sites in the basin are suitable for regional stormwater projects, and the Port owns some of these sites. It may be in the best interest of the stream and drainage system to see these sites used for larger regional projects, not just for projects the Port is required to build as part of the CSMP.

How will the Miller and Salmon basin plan become effective?

Before the recommendations of the Plan can be carried out, the legislative bodies (County and City Councils, Port Commission) of the Partners will need to review and approve the Plan. In addition, before any capital projects can be carried out, the same legislative bodies would need to prepare and authorize a separate inter-local agreement and allocate funds. The public can comment on all formal actions of their local or County Council.

How much will the Miller and Salmon Creek Basin Plan effort cost?

The total estimated cost of the planning effort is about \$580,000. A grant from the King Conservation District and funds from a related White Center Greenway project and King County's Clean Water Act Compliance Program will contribute about \$175,000 for this study. The remaining costs will be split among the partners by impervious area, land area and population.

Who can I call for addition information?

You can contact the following representatives for your area:

City of Burien	Stephen Clark	206-248-5514
City of SeaTac	Dale Schroeder	206-439-4716
Unincorporated King County	Curt Crawford	206-296-8329

As the Basin Plan progresses, this and other information about the Salmon and Miller/Walker Basins will be posted on the following websites:

Burien:	www.ci.burien.wa.us
King County:	http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/
SeaTac:	www.ci.seatac.wa.us

Prepared September, 2002
Revised November 21, 2002